

REMARKS

Claims 1-18 are currently pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 10-18 are amended. Support for the amendments to claims 10-18 can be found in the specification, for example, at page 5, lines 8-16. No new matter is added.

Entry of the amendments is proper under 37 CFR §1.116 because the amendments:

(a) place the application in condition for allowance for the reasons discussed herein; (b) do not raise any new issue requiring further search and/or consideration, as the amendments amplify issues previously discussed throughout prosecution; and (c) place the application in better form for appeal, should an appeal be necessary. The amendments are necessary and were not earlier presented because they are made in response to arguments raised in the final rejection. Entry of the amendments is thus respectfully requested.

Applicants appreciate the courtesies shown to Applicants' representative by Examiners Park and Bali in the April 21, 2008 personal interview. Applicants' separate record of the substance of the interview is incorporated into the following remarks.

Claims 10-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being drawn to nonstatutory subject matter. By this Amendment, claims 10-18 are amended responsive to the rejection. As agreed during the personal interview, claims 10-18 satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §101. Applicants thus respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

Claims 1 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Mukoyama et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,831,659) in view of Botchy (*C Magazine*; "Speed-up Techniques and Thinking Routine for 3D Games Found Source Code of a 3D Game 'Doom'"). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Mukoyama and Botchy, alone or in a permissible combination, do not teach or suggest every claimed feature of independent claims 1 and 10. For example, Mukoyama and Botchy do not teach or suggest "disposing in the object space a model object including a plurality of

part objects each of which has a projection shape, each of the part objects having a projecting portion formed on a display surface on which an image is drawn," as recited in independent claim 1, and as similarly recited in independent claim 10 (emphasis added).

The Office Action asserts that Mukoyama discloses this feature at Figs. 14 and 15 (see Office Action, page 4). However, Figs. 14 and 15 merely disclose two dimensional display elements P with no projecting portion formed on the two-dimensional display surface. The Office Action asserts on page 4 that Fig. 15 discloses a projecting portion as a vector v1 that projects towards the point of view VP. However, this alleged "projecting portion" is not part of the display element P, but is merely an imaginary line showing the ideal viewpoint to which the display element P may be viewed (see col. 14, lines 35-65 of Mukoyama).

Therefore, for at least these reasons, claims 1 and 10 are patentable over the combination of Mukoyama and Botchy. Applicants thus respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

Claims 2-9 and 11-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Mukoyama in view of Botchy and in further view of Nakagawa (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0135603). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Mukoyama, Botchy and Nakagawa, alone or in a permissible combination, do not teach or suggest every claimed feature of independent claims 3 and 12. Mukoyama, Botchy and Nakagawa do not teach or suggest "mapping on each of the part objects the Z texture for forming a virtual projection shape on the display surface of the part objects by pixel unit," as recited in independent claim 3, and as similarly recited in independent claim 12.

The Office Action acknowledges that Mukoyama and Botchy do not teach storing Z texture (see Office Action, page 5). Further, Nakagawa does not remedy the above-described deficiencies of Mukoyama and Botchy.

Nakagawa merely relates to hidden surface removal by using a Z-buffer (see paragraph [0139] of Nakagawa). Nakagawa does not relate to using a Z-buffer to form a virtual projection shape, e.g., to set bump shapes on the display surface (see specification at page 10, line 18-page 11, line 7). Therefore, Nakagawa does not teach or suggest mapping the Z texture by pixel unit, as recited in independent claims 3 and 12.

Therefore, for at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 3 and 12 are patentable over the combination of Mukoyama, Botchy and Nakagawa. Claims 4-9, 11 and 13-18 variously depend from independent claims 3 and 12. Further, claim 2 depends from independent claim 1. Therefore, claims 2, 4-9, 11 and 13-18 are patentable for at least their dependency on the independent claims, as well as for the additional features they recite. Applicants thus respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. O'Neill
Registration No. 27,075

Patrick T. Muffo
Registration No. 60,342

JAO:PTM/lrh

Date: May 14, 2008

Attachment: Petition for Extension of Time

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 320850
Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461
--